UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,408	04/15/2004	Masaru Kawai	056207.53989US	6482
23911 CROWELL & I	7590 03/05/200 MORING LLP	EXAMINER		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP			CAZAN, LIVIUS RADU	
P.O. BOX 1430 WASHINGTO	00 N, DC 20044-4300		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		3729	
<u></u>				
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/05/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		10/824,408	KAWAI ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
		Livius R. Cazan	3729		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
2a)⊠	Since this application is in condition for allowar	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	:x рапе Quayle, 1935 С.D. 11, 43	03 U.G. 213.		
Dispositi	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.			
Applicati	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc. Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. & 119		•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some colon None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
2) Notice 3) Information	et(s) See of References Cited (PTO-892) See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) See of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) See No(s)/Mail Date 2/9/07.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on 2/9/2007 has been fully considered and made of record.

Unless otherwise specified, all rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 as well as any specification and/or claim objections have been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, claim 1 states the tapered surface is formed on "only one of outer perimetric ends" (In. 8). Claim 5 on the other hand states the tapered surface is formed on "said outer [...] perimetric ends of said rotor core." As claimed in claim 5, it would appear the tapered surface is formed on all perimetric ends, not on a single perimetric end, as claimed in claim 1. The same issue is present in claims 10 and 12.

Further, in claims 2 and 3, Ins. 4 and 5, "forming force applied" should read -forming force--. In claim 4, In. 3, "constraints" should read --constrains--. In claim 5;
"permanent-magnetic" should read --permanent-magnet--. In claim 11, In. 8, "end"
should read --ends--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/824,408

Art Unit: 3729

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-14 as best understood are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (US20020138968 to Kato et al.) in view of Habert (US3714484).

As discussed in the Office Action mailed on 10/04/2006, Kato discloses substantially the same invention as the Applicant. The arguments as applied in the above-mentioned Office Action apply to the claims as amended.

However, Kato does not disclose the newly added limitation of forming a tapered surface on only one of the outer perimetric ends of each magnetic pole claw.

Habert teaches forming a tapered surface on only one outer perimetric end of each pole claw, in order to reduce noise (see Figs. 4-8; see col. 2, Ins. 28-46).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Kato, in view of the teachings of Habert, by utilizing a set of dies which create a well-defined tapered surface on one of the outer perimetric ends of each pole claw. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so in order to address the issue of noise.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Application/Control Number: 10/824,408

Art Unit: 3729

•

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Livius R. Cazan whose telephone number is (571) 272-

8032. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor. Peter Vo can be reached on (571)272-4690. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/824,408

Art Unit: 3729

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LRC 02/20/2007

PETER VO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Page 5